UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/502,818	02/11/2000	Neelakantan Sundaresan	ARC-00-0004-US1	5719

7590   04/29/2003

Samuel A Kassatly
6819 Trinidad Drive
San Jose, CA   95120

EXAMINER
CHANNAVAJJALA, SRIRAMA T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2177	

DATE MAILED: 04/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Paper No. 9

Application Number: 09/502,818
Filing Date: February 11, 2000
Appellant(s): SUNDARESAN, NEELAKANTAN

MAILED

APR 2 9 2003

Technology Center 2100

Samuel A. Kassatly
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed on 10 February 2003.

(1)   Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief, page 2

is correct.

(2)   Related Appeals and Interferences

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences, which will directly affect

or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is

contained in the brief.

(3)   Status of Claims

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief page 2 is correct.

(4)   Status of Amendments After Final

No amendment after final has been filed.

(5)   Summary of Invention

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6)   Issues

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief page 4 is correct.

(7)   Grouping of Claims

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 1-5,6-10,11-16 and 17-22 are

grouped together stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR

1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

(8)   Claims Appealed

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief

page 18-22 is correct.

(9)   Prior Art of Record

| 6,363,377 | Kravets et al. | 03 2002 |
| 6,263,332 | Nasr et al. | 07 2001 |

(10)   Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1.   Claims 1- 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kravets et al., [hereafter Kravets], US Patent No. 6363377 in view of Nasr et al.,

[hereafter Nasr], US Patent No. 6263332.

2.   As to Claims 1,6,11, 17, Kravets teaches a system which including 'automatically

generating dynamic search abstracts' [see Abstract, col 2, line 47-52, line 53-56],

fig 11], Kravets teaches search engine for refining, filtering and organizing search

queries and search results as detailed in Abstract, especially fig 11 is the query results

corresponds to abstracts, 'a crawler for crawling documents and acquiring metadata

and link information from the documents' [col 1, line 43-53, col 10, line 12-34, line 66-

67, col 11, line 1-6], Kravets specifically suggests several web engines such as Alta

Vista, Excite, Web Crawler capable of sending programs for example robots or

crawlers which automatically peruse the web and gather web pages, automatically

indexing the collected web pages as detailed in col 1, line 43-53, also Kravets teaches

meta data related to each document that represents conditions to be satisfied in order

for a document to be considered a match as detailed in table 2, col 10, line 23-26,

'a metadata repository for storing the metadata acquired by the crawler'

[col 1, line 47-55], Kravets suggests search engines store words of a documents

corresponds to storing metadata acquired by web Crawler, 'an indexing engine for

periodically indexing the metadata and the link information' [col 9, line 10-22, col 6, line

46-63], Kravets specifically teaches Harvest search engine fig 8, element 816 which is

configured to index all the pages, examiner interpreting index engine corresponds to

Kravets's Harvest search engine as detailed in fig 8, also Kravets teaches generating

dynamic set of URLs as detailed inn col 9, line 10-12, 'a search engine for applying a

search query to the metadata indexed by the indexing engine to generate a preliminary

result set containing selected abstracts' [col 10, line 3-34, line 66-67, col 11, line 1-6,

fig 4, fig 11] , 'search engine inquires if the link repository contains new link information

about preliminary result set, and updates the selected abstracts based on the new link

information, if any, to generate the dynamic search abstracts' [col 11, line 33-41, col 12,

line 6-23, line 42-52]. It is however noted that Kravets does not specifically teach 'an

abstract engine' although Kravets specifically suggests abstract query language that

can easily be mapped to any particular engine's language [see col 10, line 13-14].

On the other hand, Nasr teaches a system which including 'an abstract engine'

[see fig 1B, element 30, col 3, line 5-10].

It would have been obvious one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Nasr et al., into refining and

improving search queries and organizing the results of a search query by different and

overlapping criteria of Kravets because they both are directed to query processing,

more specifically searching for information on the Web using search engine [see

Kravets: Abstract, Nasr: Abstract]. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention would have been motivated to modify Kravets's fig 1A to incorporate the

teachings of Nasr's Abstract Engine fig 1B, element 30 because that would have

allowed users of Kravets's search query system to compile number of similar search

quests in a number of differing languages such as detailed in fig 1B, elements 5a-5d,

then abstract engine run the search to obtain search results, bringing the advantages

of supporting any number of query languages, thus improving the processing of query

and validate the results efficiently as suggested by Nasr [see col 2, line 22-24].

3.   As to Claims 2,7, 14, 20, Kravets teaches a system which including 'query

transformer, which when prompted by the search query, applies a query request to the

metadata and the link information indexed by the indexing engine' [col 4, line 66-67, col

5, line 1-2, line 50-56, col 8, line 49-54].

4.   As to Claims 3,8,15, 21, Kravets teaches a system which including 'search

results transformer that transforms the dynamic search abstracts into a user browsable

form' [col 7, line 61-65, col 8, line 18-25].

5.   As to Claims 4,9,16,22, Kravets teaches a system which including 'link repository

stores persistent link information and maintains a crawl history' [fig 1A, element 11,

col 3, line 62-65].

6.   As to Claims 5,10, 12, 18, Kravets teaches a system which including 'at least one

of the selected abstracts includes information gathered from a source other than a

candidate page associated with the selected abstract' [fig 11, col 13, line 21-29].

7.   As to Claims 13, 19 Kravets teaches a system which including 'if the link

repository does not contain new link information, presenting abstracts previously stored

in the link repository' [col 8, line 49-62].

(11)   Response to Argument

a)   At page 11, line 8-10, Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection

ground is insufficient to show that Kravets teaches "<u>automatically generating dynamic</u>

<u>search abstracts</u>"

b)   At page 11, line 14-16, Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Kravets does

not address the problems associated with search abstracts, and thus does not resolve

these problems.

c)   At page 12, line 7-10, Claim 1, Applicant submits that this reasoning is equally

deficient in that it does not specifically show that Kravets teaches "automatically

generating dynamic search abstracts"................

d)   At page 12, line 16-17, Claim 1, as a result, the Kravets system cannot be said to

be automatic.

As to the above argument [a-d], Examiner disagree with the applicant because

firstly, Kravets is directed to search engine for a refining, filtering and organizing search

queries and search results [see Abstract, fig 11].

Secondly, Kravets specifically teaches dynamic set of record tokens to restrict

the results of a search query that infact, saves users time as well as organize and

search queries and documents that satisfy the query [see col 2, line 53-61].

Thirdly, Kravets specifically teaches for example search engine by automatically

and selectively modifying individual query terms in users' query as detailed in col 2, line

47-52, further it is noted that Kravets suggests for example search engines send out programs called robots, or crawlers, which automatically peruse the Web and gather Web pages they discover. The collected pages are automatically indexed and collected into a database. [see col 1, line 47-50], therefore, Kravets teaches said to be automatic.

As best understood by the examiner, search engines are the powerful tools for getting or finding information on the world wide web or WWW, further search tools enables users to access information across internet is well known in the art. It is also noted that due to dynamic nature and number of information sources on the world wide web continuously increasing that makes indexing with keywords or subject titles attributed by human experts virtually impossible, therefore, the task is possible with only automatically generate indexing of information for example popular search services such as AltaVista, Excite, HotBot, InfoSeek, Lycos, NorthemLight and like as discussed by Kravets et al., in the background of the invention [see Kravets :col 1, line 45-50] and well known in the art.

Further in the previous office action, examiner clearly stated that Kravets et al., teaches search engine for refining, filtering and organizing search queries and search results as detailed in the Abstract, especially fig 11 is an example of search results that corresponds to abstracts, therefore, Kravets teaches automatically generating dynamic search abstracts.

e)   At page 13, line 12-15, Applicant admits that the use of abstract engines was

known prior to the filing of the present application, and thus make no claim as to the

abstract engines per se. Rather, Applicant is claiming the combination of the novel

features recited in Claim 1.

f)   At page 13, line 16-18, Applicant further submits that the office action did not

provide a justifiable reason..................

As to the above arguments [e-f], Examiner noted that *Applicant admits that the*

use of abstract engines was known prior to the filing of the present application [page 10,

line 1 page 13, line 12-13], especially Nasr et al., prior art does teach abstract engine

In the previous office action examiner stated that Kravets et al., does not teach 'abstract

engine', but at the same time not only Kravets et al. specifically teaches various search

engines that automatically generate indexing of information for example popular search

services such as AltaVista, Excite, HotBot, InfoSeek, Lycos, NorthemLight but also

Kravets et al suggests abstract query language that can easily be mapped to any

particular engine's language [col 10, line 13-14], further Kravets also suggests for

example most search engines, there are two types of data that the user can input:

content that is to be matched to the text of documents, and structure, or meta data,

related to each document that represents conditions to be satisfied in order for a

document to be considered a match, for example in the AltaVista query shown in table 2

[see col 10, line 15-34].

On the other hand, Nasr specifically teaches 'abstract engine' [see fig 1B, element 30, col 3, line 5-10], abstract engine corresponds to Nasr's fig 1B, element 30. It is also noted that both Kravets and Nasr teach abstract language related to search query [see Kravets: col 10, line 13-14; Nasr: fig 1B, col 3, line 7-10]

Therefore, It would have been obvious one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Nasr et al., into refining and improving search queries and organizing the results of a search query by different and overlapping criteria of Kravets because they both are directed to query processing, more specifically searching for information on the Web using search engine [see Kravets: Abstract, Nasr: Abstract], also teaches abstract language related to search query [see Kravets: col 10, line 13-14; Nasr: fig 1B, col 3, line 7-10] and both are from same field of endeavor.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify Kravets's fig 1A to incorporate the teachings of Nasr's Abstract Engine fig 1B, element 30 because that would have allowed users of Kravets's search query system to compile number of similar search quests in a number of differing languages such as detailed in fig 1B, elements 5a-5d, then abstract engine run the search to obtain search results, bringing the advantages of supporting any number of query languages, thus improving the processing of query and validate the results efficiently as suggested by Nasr [see col 2, line 22-24].

g)   At page 14, line 11-14, Claim 1, applicant submits that the foregoing groud is

untenable since it still does not clarify how" a search engine that dynamically filtering

organizing........link information

h)   At page 15, line 8-9, Claim 1, Kravets does not acquire link information.

        As to the above arguments [g-h], examiner disagree with the applicant because

firstly Kravets teaches search engine that dynamically filtering, organizing documents

[see Abstract, col 9, line 10-13, line 22-26], as best understood by the examiner

Harvest search engine collects, indexing information, further Harvest search engine

intended to be a scalable form of infrastructure for building an distributing content,

indexing information as well as for accessing web information. At minimum, Kravets

suggests using Harvest search engine element 816, the output set 818 from Harvest

S1, is processed against the flag array by dynamic filter element 824 and the

intersection is returned. The algorithm also filters out duplicates [see col 9, line 22-26]

        Secondly, Kravet suggests for example fig 5 is directed to URL lens, more

specifically URL lens element 510 similar documents, in other words, URL lens finds

other URLs that contain the terms or links as detailed in col 6, line 46-63]. As best

understood by the examiner, Kravet suggests when the user chooses cell for example

534,536 that gives linking information that may be related to corresponding information

is still part of URL lens as detailed in fig 5.

i)   At page 15, line 16-18, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection ground, and

submits that Kravets' indexing engine does not index link information....

j)   At page 16, line 4-8, Claim 1, applicant traverses this rejection ground, and

submits that the URLs generated by Kravets represent the pages visited "last week" and

as result, these URLs are not the same as, or equivalent to "new link information.....

As to the above arguments [I-j], Kravets suggests using Harvest search engine

which is configured to index all the pages, [see fig 8, element 816], examiner

interpreting index engine corresponds to Kravests' Harvest search engine because

Harvest engine return pages from its index [col 9, line 18-19]. As best understood by

the examiner Harvest system consists of several subsystems for example Harvest

search system is capable of not only collects indexing information but also other

subsystems provide the flexible interface to this information, further Harvest engine is

intended to be a scalable form of infrastructure for building and distributing content,

indexing information as well as for accessing Web or internet information. It is also

noted that Kravets suggests hierarchy forest defined on all the meta-data of a query,

where each tree contains meta-data that is having relationship to other meta data as

suggested in fig 9, specifically fig 9(a) is an example of structural meta-data of a

document in the form of natural hierarchical list from the tags, [see col 10, line 66-67,

col 11, line 1-6], further Kravets also suggests hierarchical list form the tags that specify

the prominent information in the document such as title, to tags, text and like that

corresponds to link information [col 11, line 1-14], it is to be noted new link information is

not only part of meta-data, but also part of dynamic filtering process because Kravets at

minimum suggests dynamic filtering implemented anywhere one desires to restrict/filter

one set of URLs by another set of URLs [col 9, line 27-29]. It is however, noted that

both Kravets et al. and Nasr et al. directed to querying, specifically searching

information on the internet, as best understood by the examiner, a location on the

Internet containing one or more text, graphical images and including for navigating

through various websites that typically contain links to other web sites [see Kravets:

fig 4,fig 11, col 1, line 47-49], It s also noted that A link consists of a webpage address

in the form of a Uniform Resource Locator or URL such as detailed in Kravets fig 4,

fig 11, further a relative link(s) consist of the relative path from the current webpage to

the linked-to-webpage, for example see fig 11, a webpage may link to another,

webpage by embedding within its HTML the address, in the form of the URL, of the

other webpage, a particular URL uniquely identifies a particular webpage and well

known in the art, therefore, new link information is integral part of Kravets et al.

teaching.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Srirama Channavajjala
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2177

sc
April 25, 2003

Conferees

John E Breene
SPE AU 2177

Alam, Hosain
Primary Examiner, AU2172

Samuel A Kassatly
6819 Trinidad Drive
San Jose, CA 95120